REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated October 15, 2009. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly and completely recite the novel features of the invention within the independent claims. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the present Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 7-10 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Examiner's rejection is directed to Applicants' use of the term "substantially." Applicants first object to Examiner's rejection because the word "substantially" is a common term utilized in patent applications and in claim language. That word has very clear connotation/meaning, particularly within the context in which the word is utilized within Applicants' claims. It is clear that the phrase "substantially a same time" should be interpreted as events occurring at "approximately the same time" or "very close in time" to each other.

None-the-less, Applicants have amended the independent claims by replacing the word "substantially" with a replacement word "approximately", which has the same connotation and/or meaning in the context of the claims. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes the §112 rejection, and Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and reconsideration and removal of the §112 rejection in light of the amendment.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

In the present Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 7-8 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by *Park, et al.* (US 5,881,307) and *Nguyen* (US 6,058,465) which is incorporated by reference within *Park* in col. 3, lines 34-38. For simplicity, the references are collectively referred to as "*Park* and *Nguyen*". *Park* and *Nguyen* do not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention because *Park* and *Nguyen* do not teach each and every feature recited by Applicants' claims. Specifically, *Park* and *Nguyen* fail to teach or suggest any of the following features recited by Applicants' independent claims, as now amended:

a plurality of multiplexers each receiving a different first input from the primary register file and a different second input from the secondary register file, wherein the plurality of multiplexers select a single one of the first input and the second input as an output that is provided to one of two arithmetic units;

Park generally provides a superscalar processor in which store data is deferred within the pipeline until the data is required for transfer. As specifically recited by the Abstract, Park provides:

> For store instructions, reading store data from a register file is deferred until the store data is required for transfer to a memory system. This allows the store instructions to be decoded simultaneously with earlier instructions that generate the store data. A simple antidependency interlock uses a list of the register numbers identifying registers holding store data for pending store instructions. These register number are compared to the register numbers of destination operands of instructions, and instructions having destination operands matching a source of store data are stalled in the read stage to prevent the instruction from destroying store data before an earlier store instruction is complete.

The specific sections of *Park* relied upon by Examiner, namely col 3, line 7 to col. 4, line 44 is completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the above features of Applicants example claim element. In fact, the entire structure described by *Park* is different in configuration from that of Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants note the clear distinctions between *Park*'s architecture figure (i.e., FIG. 1) from that of Applicants' claimed invention (i.e., FIG. 2). When read with reference to FIG. 2 and the specification, it is clear that the structure presented by Applicants' claimed invention is very different from and is neither taught nor suggested by *Park* and *Nguyen*.

The standard for a §102 rejection requires that the cited reference(s) teach each and every element recited in the claims set forth within the invention. As clearly outlined above, *Park* and *Nguyen* fail to meet this standard. *Park* and *Nguyen*, therefore, does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention, and Applicants' claims are allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the present Office Action, Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Park* and *Nguyen* as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Official Notice. Applicants object to the unsubstantiated and/or unsupported use of the Official Notice. However, the present rejection has been traversed by the dependence of Claims 9-10 on allowable base Claim 1. By their dependence on an allowable base claim, Claims 9-10 are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to more clearly and completely recite the novel features of the invention within the independent claims. Applicants have also provided arguments which explain why Applicants' claims are not anticipated by or obvious in light of the references or combinations thereof. The amendments and arguments overcome the §§102 and 103 rejections, and Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eustace P. Isidore/

Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)